

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Official Action dated March 31, 2006, placing the present patent application under final rejection.

Starting at page 2, paragraph 2 of the Official Action, Claims 1 - 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner has proposed revisions to the claims to overcome the formal grounds of rejection. Applicant has amended the claims to adopt the Examiner's suggested revisions. Applicant respectfully submits that the form of the claims, as revised herein, overcomes all formal grounds of rejection raised in the Official Action, and that the form of the pending claims complies with 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, in all respects.

In the Official Action, the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 8 as being anticipated by the Schofield patent (U.S. Pat. No. 515,097) has been maintained. In response to arguments presented by Applicant in the Amendment filed on January 23, 2006, the Examiner states, at page 4, paragraph 8 of the Official Action:

"...Applicant's primary argument is based on that the '097 reference is not directed to panel curtains and that the reference discloses only a conventional foldable curtain. However, the claims do not clearly define "panel curtains". As pointed out by applicant, "panel curtains" are

comparatively stiff, but they may also be soft. '097 certainly meets the limitations as claimed."

In response to the Examiner's comments, independent Claims 1 and 8 have been revised to more clearly define the nature of "panel curtains". As discussed at page 10 of the Amendment filed on January 23, 2006, the expression "panel curtains" is a term recognized in the relevant art as meaning flat curtains that are hung so that they cannot be folded. Independent Claims 1 and 8 have now been revised to expressly recite that the claimed curtain is mounted to hang flatly from a hanger, and is movable with the hanger along a rod without folding.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 8, which clearly define the nature of the panel curtains, are patentably distinguishable over the Schofield patent which discloses only a conventional foldable curtain having a plurality of eyelets for split-rings which are mounted in the bar B of twin rings A, A1. (See pages 11 - 12 of Amendment filed on January 23, 2006).

Independent Claims 1 and 8 were rejected only as being anticipated by the Schofield patent in the last Official Action. There is clearly no strict identity of invention between the Schofield patent and the system and method now defined by independent Claims 1 and 8. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the conventional foldable curtains disclosed by

Schofield clearly do not suggest or recognize the systems and methods now defined by independent Claims 1 and 8.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the prior art of record. The remaining dependent claims, which depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 or 8, are allowable, at least for the same reasons as their respective parent independent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment be entered notwithstanding the Final Action. The form of the claims has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner in the Final Action, to overcome formal grounds of rejection raised in the Final Action. Accordingly, these revisions to the form of the claims do not affect the substance of the claims.

Additionally, Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to more clearly define the nature of "panel curtains", in view of the Examiner's comments made at page 4, paragraph 8 of the Final Action. The scope of Claims 1 and 8 are now consistent with the arguments presented in support of the allowance of these claims made by Applicant in the Amendment filed on January 23, 2006, prior to the issuance of the Final Action. The revisions to independent Claims 1 and 8 to more clearly define the nature of the panel curtains disclosed and claimed by Applicant, clearly places these claims in condition for allowance over the prior art applied in the Final Action.

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark P. Stone', written in a cursive style.

Mark P. Stone
Reg. No. 27,954
Attorney for Applicant
25 Third Street, 4th Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
(203) 329-3355